

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/848,731	05/19/2004	Joost W. D. Pronk van Hoogeveen	03226.414001; SUN040642 7336	
32615 OSHA LIANG	7590 12/13/200° L.L.P./SUN	EXAMINER		
	EY, SUITE 2800	WOOD, WILLIAM H		
HOUSTON, TX 77010			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/13/2007	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lord@oshaliang.com hemandez@oshaliang.com DOCKETING@OSHALIANG.COM

				AL
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	7//
•		10/848,731	PRONK VAN HOO	OGEVEEN ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	•	William H. Wood	2193	
 Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress
A SHO WHICH - Extens after S - If NO p - Failure Any rej	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL'HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Daions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing a patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)☐ ☐ 3)☐ S	Responsive to communication(s) filed on $19 N$ . This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowal closed in accordance with the practice under $E$ .	s action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro		e merits is
Dispositio	on of Claims	•		
5)□ ( 6)⊠ ( 7)□ (	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Applicatio	on Papers			
10)⊠ T	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 19 May 2004 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrective oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1.	☑ accepted or b)☐ objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)	acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document according to the copies of the priority document application from the International Burease the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received.  Its have been received in Applicate ority documents have been received in Applicate (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage
Attachment(	s)	PRIMAF	YEXAMINER	•
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 12/27/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate	

Number: 10/848,731

Art Unit: 2193

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-18 are pending and have been examined.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 27 December 2006 was considered by the examiner.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 14 and 17 are directed toward software *per se* as the "system" claimed recites only elements of software.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent

Number: 10/848,731

Art Unit: 2193

or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-8, 14, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Barritz** et al. (US 6,889,376 B1).

#### Claim 1

Barritz discloses a method for installing an application, comprising:

creating a zone (column 5, lines 9-11, the current computer);

installing the application in the zone to obtain a remote zone (column 5,

lines 9-11, software and data on the current computer);

packaging the remote zone to obtain an application zone package (column 5, lines 13-15, packing); and

deploying the application zone package in a target global zone (column 5, lines 13-15, moving to the second computer).

Claim 2

Barritz discloses the method of claim 1, wherein installing the application in

Page 4

the zone comprises:

determining at least one application configuration parameter for the

application (column 1, lines 65-67); and

configuring the remote zone using the at least one application

configuration parameter (column 1, lines 65-67).

Claim 3

Barritz discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the at least one configuration

parameter comprises a network port (column 2, line 1-5).

Claim 4

Barritz discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the at least one configuration

parameter comprises a memory parameter (column 2, line 1-5).

Claim 5

Barritz discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the at least one configuration

parameter comprises a user account (column 2, line 1-5).

Number: 10/848,731

Art Unit: 2193

<u>Claim 6</u>

Barritz discloses the method of claim 1, wherein packaging the remote zone

comprises:

copying the remote zone to obtain a copy of the remote zone (column 11,

Page 5

liens 7-11, and 20); and

converting the copy of the remote zone into the application zone package

(column 11, lines 7-11, and 20).

<u>Claim 7</u>

Barritz discloses the method of claim 6, wherein the application zone package

is a self-extracting file (column 8, line 64).

Claim 8

**Barritz** discloses the method of claim 6, wherein the application zone package

comprises a configuration script (column 12, lines 23-30).

Claims 14, 16 and 18

The limitations of claims 14, 16 and 18 correspond to the limitations of claims

1 and 7 and as such are rejected in a corresponding manner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Application/Control Number: 10/848,731

Art Unit: 2193

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Barritz** et al. (US 6,889,376 B1) in view of **VMware**VirtualCenter User's Manual.

### <u>Claim 9</u>

**Barritz** discloses the method of claim 1, wherein deploying the application zone package comprises:

accessing the target global zone (as for claim 1);

configuring a target zone (as for claim 1);

installing the target zone (as for claim 1);

unpacking the application zone package to obtain the remote zone (as for claim 1); and

copying a copy of the remote zone into a file space occupied by the target zone (as for claim 1).

Barritz did not explicitly state a non-global zone. VMware demonstrated that it was known at the time of invention to develop and configure non-global zones within global zones and migrate virtual machines between them (chapter

8, starting on page 139; page 204, figure). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the migration system of one remote zone to a target as in Barritz with targets of a non-global zone within a global zone as found in VMware's teaching. This implementation would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide migration of systems in virtual environments for the list known benefits (VMware: page 12, last paragraph).

Page 7

# Claims 10-13, 15 and 17

The limitations of claims 10-13, 15 and 17 correspond to the limitations of claims 1-9, 14, 16 and 18 and are therefore rejected in a corresponding manner.

Art Unit: 2193

# Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Wood whose telephone number is (571)-272-3736. The examiner can normally be reached 10:00am - 4:00pm Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)-272-3756. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained form either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR systems, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. For questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900

William H. Wood Patent Examiner AU 2193

Page 8

December 8, 2007